UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Are We Like That?

By H. R. MUSSEY

The Drive Against Liberalism in America

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part II, Chapter XXV. By M. K. GANDHI

VOLUME XCIX NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 7, 1927

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
HERMAN L. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WAPLES, Cincinnati.
J. G. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Afina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Announcement

Part II

OF GANDHI'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

began in this magazine on

September 20th

GANDHI'S RETURN TO INDIA
HIS LAW PRACTISE
BEGINNING OF HIS PUBLIC CAREER
and
THE GREAT STORY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Subscribe Now! *Renew Now!*

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Sirs: Enclosed please find $3.00, for which
(a) Enter my subscription for one year from date,
or
(b) Renew my subscription for one year from date of expiration.

Name .....

Address .....

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 3

Are We Like That?—H. R. MUSSEY 5

Jottings—J. H. H. 7

Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—SYDNEY STRONG 7

ARTICLES—

A Message to a War Resister—*Romain Rolland* 3

The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part II, Chapter XXV. In India—M. K. GANDHI 9

The Drive Against Liberalism in America—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 10

POETRY—

To a Poet Friend—DOMBEY SHEPERD 8

Vision—EDITH CAROLYN NEWLIN 8

THE FIELD—

Abraham Lincoln Centre Friday Morning Forum 16

Conference on Education for World Citizenship 15

In Support of Senator Borah—EDWIN D. MEAD. 15

Resolutions Passed Unanimously at Mass Meeting, Lyric Theatre, New York City 16

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCIX MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1927 NUMBER 1

A MESSAGE TO A WAR RESISTER

I want to tell you, that I never worry about the immediate or future success of ideals which I know to be true, healthy and sacred. The success does not concern us. We are servants of our ideals. We have only to serve them bravely and faithfully. Whether we shall be victors or vanquished this matters little. It is a joy to serve the eternal and to sacrifice oneself for it. I do not love those at all who so ardently expect a sort of human paradise on earth, and I have no confidence in them. Those are weak people who in order to act morally feel that they must be promised an early reward, either for themselves or for their own people. The reward lies in your own self—it does not come from outside. It lies in our faith, our struggles, our courage. —*Romain Rolland.*

The War Resister.

China has done it! She has called the attention of the League of Nations to the situation in the East, and asked the Geneva body to take action against Britain in respect to the latter's action in sending troops to Shanghai. The League of Nations itself, as we have already pointed out, would never think of such a thing as interfering with or even noticing what is going on in China, which is one of its own members, by the way. War might proceed there indefinitely, European troops might invade the land of the Dragon and slay its inhabitants by the millions, but the League would do nothing. How could it do anything, with England and France the interested parties in China, safeguarding their imperialistic investments by the old familiar method of war? England, France and the other great powers have no intention of letting the Geneva body run amuck in this silly peace business. O, yes, it may be all right when Roumania, or Bulgaria, or Greece, or Czechoslovakia are brandishing arms and killing one another. This is inconvenient, messy business, affecting no large interests of civilization, and these little fellows must be brought to time. So the League, like a big policeman with a gang of little boys, stops the fray and thus vindicates law and order. But when these big fellows break loose—when they send shiploads of troops and machine-guns over thousands of miles of sea to make war upon the distracted myriads of China—well, that's a different piece of business altogether. The League interfere with a war of this kind—a war in defense of civilization, Christianity, and dividends? Not much! What are we to suppose England and France are in the League for anyway, if not to stop foolish nonsense of this particular type? But now China stands right up, and asks what's what? Can one member of the League actually make war upon another member, and the League not even try to save its face? That's an interesting question. It looks at last as though, after eight years or so of bluffing, we were going to have a real show down. We would give our good right hand to be in Geneva on March 7th, when this challenge is faced by the Council under the chairmanship of Austen Chamberlain.

It certainly was enough to make a cat laugh, to see the Democrat and Republican Congressmen tumbling over one another to vote for the McNary-Haugen bill providing farm relief. This bill, of course, was state Socialism of the most arrant description. It put the government into the business of buying and selling. If a surplus of crops appeared in any year, the government was to purchase enough of these crops to relieve the market and thus keep up the prices for the benefit of the producing farmers. For this purpose the bill provided for huge loans from the government, amounting perhaps to hundreds of millions of dollars. These funds were to pay for the purchase, holding, and possible sale at a loss of the surplus products thus taken from private into public ownership. What is such a scheme as this but Socialism—the kind of thing that has to be done, with railroads in war time, with Cape Cod canals in peace time, when the accepted processes of our existing economic order break down and thus no longer work?

In spite of all theories, (says the *New Republic*) the farmers in their distress turned to the federal government to do a job which nobody else can do, a job, in fact, bigger than any government has been asked to do in times of peace, if we except Soviet Russia.

Yet our conservative Republicans and Democrats in Congress, scared to death of "reds," refusing to recognize Russia, hating and denouncing everything called Socialism, here put through a measure which puts the government right into the business of farming. Thus does radicalism make its way! An old system no longer functions—something must be done—and it *is* done, in terms which, if understood and properly labeled, would scare most of us to death. Whether the McNary-Haugen bill would have accomplished the object in view, we do not know. It looked to us like a half-baked, essentially dishonest piece of legislation. Its real character unconfessed, it attempted to do half-heartedly what should be done openly and

thoroughly, or not at all. But its value as indicating what we are coming to in this swollen, wasteful, and immoral capitalism of ours, was, and still is, invaluable, Let it be said, in fairness to President Coolidge, that he was more consistent and straightforward in his public action than were most of the Congressmen. The bill contravened every last item of his laissez-faire, individualistic creed, and he vetoed it.

Fascism must be about to go down. The Pope jumps upon it with less and less caution. The week scarcely passes these latter days when some new outbreak of the Roman hierarchy against the Mussolinian program is not recorded. The papal diplomacy would have been stupid indeed if it had not long ago discerned the open joint in Mussolini's armor. He has been bold, uncompromising, often violent, in dealing with other powers and institutions which had the capacity to resist him. But at no time has be attacked the papal hierarchy. Doubtless he has not dared. For Mussolini stops at naught which he dares. A manifest and unqualified opposition from the Roman See would cripple him seriously if not disastrously. The Italian people have not been for ages under the domination of the Roman hierarchy without an effect upon their essential character. They cannot follow secular leadership, even of the boldness and magnetism of Mussolini, in a frontal attack upon the prerogative of the Pope. The House of Savoy ever since Cavour and 1870 has had to watch its step. Though it succeeded in crowding the papal train behind the walls of the Vatican, it has been compelled consistently to keep eyes and ears closed to the fulminations emitted from the Vatican gates. Though it has won, its conquest has come from stooping. Mussolini is not the man to stoop. But he was conscious that he could not practice his high-handed methods upon the entrenched Roman See. He could not break into the Vatican. So, he sought to bring the Pope and all the papal baggage into his camp, by deferential and cozening attitudes which have amazed observers of the secular Mussolini. He seems to have failed. It must be a bitter pill for him to swallow. The traditional attitudes of the House of Savoy do not attract the mighty Duce. Can he allow the Pope to fulminate and keep serene?

The tale of student suicides continues to mount. As this is written the total for the past two months is fourteen. Before it is printed other high school and college youth will probably fling away their lives in disgust of the meaning our society is giving it, or in reckless curiosity to learn whether it is not better to be dead. What is the matter? Is the condition normal, as several university and college presidents appear to wish the public to believe? Sadly normal, doubtless. But not a "wave," not an "epidemic"? Whatever contagion there is is largely created by the newspapers, these educators assert, in bringing together isolated incidents, and exploiting them in sensational headlines. Cold-blooded analysis of the situation does not relieve the anxiety of parents. Something is the matter, something big as well as bad, most parents and plain citizens are inclined to believe. Those who delight in "passing the buck" will find here another opportunity to bandy responsibility back and forth between the home and the school. Send us healthier, sounder-minded youth out of the home, the educator demands, and they will meet our requirements. Relieve our boys and girls of the present terrific pressure of the school program, parents protest, and they will justify the care we have given them. Tests show that children are stronger and freer from physical defects than ever before. Tests also show that educators are tightening the screws. They admit it. They boast of it. The popularity of education among the young since the war has flooded all institutions with applicants. Schools have almost universally taken advantage of this opportunity to "raise standards," stiffen entrance examinations and multiply elimination tests. How far does this account for the suicides among students? The more or less incoherent notes which some of them leave behind refer to the strain under which they have worked. Anxiety over examinations, past or in prospect, is mentioned as the cause of mental unbalance in certain cases. Is standardized, high-pressure education true education?

Housing for the poor is poor housing. Yet every large city in the land continues to knit anxious brows over the question of how the need can be met. The abolition of poverty would solve all the problems of "organized charity," and most of the problems of all other social agencies. Such proposal is simply ridiculous to most, just as the proposal to abolish war is ridiculous, as the proposal to abolish slavery was ridiculous, as the proposal to abolish alcoholism was and still is ridiculous, to a multitude. "The poor ye have always with you" is a full and final social philosophy for some of us. We have grown so accustomed to messing over social problems, pecking away here, and scratching the surface there, that we have neither the courage nor the mental capacity to go to the roots of evils. Literally, those who want to go to the roots of things are radicals. Radicals are very dangerous folks since war made us timid. The way most effectively to provide good housing for the poor is to keep people from being poor. We shall have to make the individual count, make him an end of social endeavor as well as social theory. The very school of social thinking and action which holds our society to the theory of individualism is most directly responsible for the sacrilege upon human life which our present system entails. It is not good for society to have poor people about. It is certainly not good for the poor

themselves. Why putter at the task, therefore, of finding homes for the poor? Success in such endeavor would be a crime against the poor and a social bane. The good citizen should hope and pray that the effort will fail. A competent authority declares that nobody can live in decency on Manhattan Island, in New York, with a family income of less than three to four thousand dollars a year. Yet the discussion of how to provide housing for the poor of Manhattan Island continues to exercise the wits of the wise men of Gotham. What is true in New York is substantially true in all of our older cities. We are playing with our social problems.

This is the way we do it in New York! Our theatres are filled with dirty plays. No sewage is fouler than the mass of smutty jokes, lascivious scenes, suggestive dress and undress which festers upon our stage. Cesspools are not allowed by law in our modern cities. If an open drain or a reeking garbage barrel is discovered by the police, the health authorities act at once, and the evil is forthwith removed or corrected. But what about our theatres? After discussion which has run in this case for more than five months, the police, after due public announcement and preparation so that a full force of newspaper reporters and photographers may be on hand for the "show," raid three plays and arrest managers and actors. The performance is then adjourned to the night-court where, after pictures have been duly taken of all the parties concerned, in all manner of attractive and dramatic poses, the offenders are released on bail. The next day injunctions are secured, prohibiting the police from interfering with the plays, which now pack their houses to the doors with eager and excited audiences. Days pass—with mobs beating upon the doors of the raided theatres, and police reserves out to keep order. Then come hearings—public, of course, with reporters and camera-men enjoying another field-day—and the prisoners are held for trial on some undetermined day in the dim and distant future. Meanwhile, having been given miles of front-page advertising which hundreds of thousands of dollars could not have bought, the offending plays settle down to long and prosperous "runs." One of the three plays, announced to close for lack of patronage, is taken to a larger theatre, and puts tickets on sale for "eight weeks in advance." This is the way we safeguard the moral health of society in New York. Police, district-attorneys, judges, courts, all turned into one vast piece of advertising machinery for dirty plays! A triumph of intelligence, no mistake about that!

Are We Like That?

I often wonder about it. Day by day I rub elbows with everyday Americans—the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief, and I conclude that we are a very decent lot; for the most part not very clever, but on the whole kind and well-intentioned; going about our business as best we know how and trying to make a living in what we regard as a useful sort of way; undertaking, so far as we can, to pay our debts and meet the next instalment on the car; and believing not only that honesty is the best policy, but that, all questions of policy aside, it is really an admirable moral quality. And I don't believe that my own observation and experience probably differ widely from those of other people.

But then I turn to the newspapers, on which I have to depend a good deal for information about matters outside my immediate field of observation, and read about oil and Mexican affairs. First I note that Mr. E. L. Doheny, on his return home after his triumphant acquittal in the recent unpleasantly pressing trial at which all the substantial facts were admitted, "was greeted by a delegation of prominent men of Los Angeles and later was the guest of honor at a so-called appreciation banquet." And I wonder, Are we like that? When I read further that some members, at least, of the Los Angeles City Club express sharp disapproval, I am heartened to believe that at any rate we are not all like that, even in a real-estate paradise. But then I recall the oil investigation that brought to light Mr. Doheny's little black bag. I remember the quick shift of newspaper criticism from the men who had bought public officials and had betrayed public trust to the faithful public servants who, in face of insuperable obstacles, persisted in digging out the facts. I remember the widespread indignation against the investigators who were "injuring business for mere partisan advantage," and I remember how the present administration, after having done all that was humanly possible to make it difficult to find out the facts, was overwhelmingly approved and triumphantly re-elected with a plurality of more than seven million. And I wonder, Are we really like that?

Then I wonder who actually has been bringing us to the very brink of war with our Mexican neighbors, for whom I am confident the most of us entertain no unfriendly feelings, but rather the sentiments of one decent human being toward another. From George Barr Baker, on the New York Evening Post, I learn that so far as oil goes, the dispute involves 28,500,000 acres of land on which rights were acquired before May 1, 1917; that of the 387 foreign companies claiming such land, all have complied with the Mexican law except 22, which among them hold 1,600,000 acres, or six per cent of the total. Then I think of the marionette sitting in the White House, and I wonder who pulls the strings and who plays the ventriloquist when it bravely pro-

tests, with apropriate gestures, that there can be no arbitration of the sacred question of American rights legally acquired. I look over the list of recusant companies, and note among others the Huasteca (controlled by the Standard Oil group, for which in general I have great respect), the Pan-American (Mr. Doheny's goldmine), and the so-called Mellon concerns (belonging to interests in which the Secretary of the Treasury has been the outstanding figure). I look at the Congressional Record of January 25, and find Senator Robinson saying:

> It is stated, upon information which I regard as reliable, that what constituted formerly very large British interests alleged to have been owned by Lord Cowdray and his associates have passed into the ownership of Mr. Mellon, or of what is known in American finance as the "Mellon group."

So it is for this that we are to encourage revolution and bloodshed in Mexico, are to make of the good name of the United States a byword and a hissing among all the peoples to the south of us, are to prove that our talk of international justice and fair play is just empty words, plain hypocrisy? Are we like that? I cannot believe it, and the outpouring of public condemnation on the administration's so-called "policy" toward Mexico makes me believe that I am right in disbelieving.

Yet I remember that the Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, one of the great distillery owners of the country, is the man at the head of prohibition enforcement; that the same man shapes our tax policy, cutting down income taxes and abolishing inheritance taxes at the same time that tariff taxes are maintained or raised on commonly consumed goods like the product of Mr. Mellon's own aluminum monopoly. And does an outraged public opinion make for itself a scourge of small cords and drive the money changer out of the temple? On the contrary, three of our leading educational institutions in a single Commencement season confer their highest honors on this same man. Are we like that, after all?—I wonder.

I return to Mexico, and find the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations considering Senator Norris's resolution calling for an investigation into reports that the State Department had tried to induce press associations to publish a statement that Mexico was seeking to establish a Bolshevist authority in Nicaragua, etc. The resolution was based on statements that Assistant Secretary Olds, a law partner of Secretary Kellogg, had sent for the Washington managers of the press associations and made the charge, stipulating that responsibility for publication should not be attributed to the Department. In response to a House resolution, Secretary Kellogg denied that the Department had made any such attempt to influence the press. I quote the New York *Times'* further account of the attitude of senators on the committee:

> One of them said that the report that Assistant Secretary Olds had made statements . . . undoubtedly was true, but to have an investigation would embarrass the State Department, and he saw no good to be accomplished by it. . . . Other senators held that the matter was not important enough to warrant any investigation.

So the committee by a vote of eight to five decided not to investigate, and I laid down my newspaper and reflected. Manifestly, in the opinion of some of these senators, the Secretary of State had made a palpably false statement concerning the action of his assistant in a matter that might in the outcome involve us in war with a neighboring country. None the less, investigation was to be avoided, because it would embarrass the Department, because it would do no good, and because it was of no importance, anyway. In other words, these senators believe (and back their belief with their votes) that it is of no importance, and that it would do no good, to establish publicly the fact whether the Secretary of State did or did not tell a downright lie in the discharge of his official duty in a matter of the highest moment to our own government, to the Mexican government, and above all, to the peoples of the United States and Mexico alike. These senators, I say, believe this. And again I wonder, Are we like that? I hope we are not; but I cannot help wondering how long a member of the British government would last under similar circumstances. My guess is that it would be about as long as it took him to write his resignation. And what does the wily and wizened politician in the White House do about it? Nothing. Are we like that? Again I wonder. At least, after more than two full year's experience with the President, seven million more of us voted for him than for his nearest competitor, keeping cool with Coolidge.

I need scarcely say that my wonder is not based on any theory of the peculiar wickedness of the politicians whose acts I reprobate. On the contrary, I honestly wonder whether they do actually represent us, whether that same good-natured, honest-meaning neighbor of mine and I who talk across the fence in the morning really do or do not have any higher standard of public morality than that indicated by the incidents just rehearsed. It is a sobering question, giving us much food for thought whichever way it be answered. For if American standards of public morality are in fact, as we love to believe, far in advance of American public life, then we face a prodigious task of political and social reorganization to bring the life abreast of the standards. And if the standards are no better than the life, then indeed is it a time for us to sit in sackcloth and ashes, crying one and all, "God be merciful to me a sinner." And in either case, to a people fat and prosperous and powerful the cry comes ringing through the thousands of years: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" I wonder if we are like that.

H. R. Mussey.

Jottings

At a dinner-party in the White House the other day, President Coolidge had as his guest, Mr. Kent Cooper of the Associated Press, Mr. Arthur Brisbane of the Hearst papers, Mr. Roy Howard of the Scripps papers, Mr. Adolph Ochs of the New York *Times*, Mr. Ogden Reid of the New York *Herald-Tribune*, Mr. Cyrus Curtis of the *Saturday Evening Post*, AND Henry Ford, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Judge Elbert Gary, Charles M. Schwab, Simon Guggenheim, and George Eastman. How we would like to have heard these gentlemen talk about the weather, the coming basball season, and the latest "movie"!

The *Nation* calls appropriate attention to the fact that when a Portugal revolution broke out and endangered American life and property, the administration sent no marines to protect either. Evidently no oil in Portugal!

"Kellogg Aid Resigns" ran the newspaper headline some days ago. Alas for that tragic ironical, superfluous, intrusive word, "Aid"! If only it could have been knocked out, and the headline read as it should have read! Then would the heavens have rejoiced, and the earth been glad. Yea, the sea would have roared, and the fullness thereof.

"If I were to give liberty to the press," said Napoleon, "my power could not last three days." So Mussolini would say, if he were as frank as the French Emperor!

The suicides of fourteen college students in less than two months mean something. What it means we do not know, nor apparently do the psychologists and educators. But that there is something at work here which bodes no good for our generation, is plain enough.

The death of Brooks Adams, following hard upon that of James Ford Rhodes, means that two of our most distinguished American historians are gone. We read Adam's "The Emancipation of Massachusetts" years ago, and have never forgotten it. That remarkable book was the forerunner of such new studies of colonial history as have found their noblest expression in the recent New England volumes of James Truslow Adams. J. H. H.

American Notes

[Editorial Correspondence]

Two remarkable men sat around the same table at Lincoln Center, Chicago, on a February Friday night. One was Arthur Ponsonby, member of Parlaiment, and the other S. O. Levinson, a Chicago lawyer. In a conspicuous way, they represent two important phases of the Outlawry of War.

Mr. Ponsonby is touring the country, lecturing, and was introduced by Francis Neilson—the two having been M. P.s together for five years. Mr. Neilson said that after talking with Mr. Ponsonby about the "Ponsonby Plan" for peace, his "doubts had been wiped away." Mr. Ponsonby said that he had not yet overcome being bewildered and nervous from being in New York! No matter what the topic may be that "is announced, I never fail to talk on peace." He had been amused to note that no matter what kind of an audience he addressed—society women, colonials, economists or the like—the mention of the fact that "I was once a page of Queen Victoria" won their attention and removed prejudice!

He mentioned several impressions: The American people were well informed, but very conventional; the women were so remarkably active that he had wondered where the men were. He was baffled by the contradiction of the inner cleanliness of the hotels and homes—spotless—and the untidiness and even filthiness of the back-yards of the villages, seen as the trains went through. He did not find among the people much praise of their politicians, due possibly to lack of contact between them and the people, there not being so much as in England. Politics seemed to be operated by the pressure of groups.

Another crucial difference was to be seen in the fact that the people of America had not suffered as had the people of England, by the War. War was not so real. In England there came from the War a large army of war-resisters. He had found as he had gone out among his constituents that when he spoke against war, the "whole audience would rise and cheer." He was led to write "Now Is the Time," and to start the "Peace Letter," a letter addressed to the Prime Minister giving him notice that in case the government went into war, the signers would be compelled to refuse war-service. At first 5,000 letters were put into circulation. Over 120,000 names had been secured, the most of them of young men who had been in the War. The people of England realized that they had been deluded. "There will be no war with China!" "The trade unions are with us."

In explaining the Peace-Letter plan, Mr. Ponsonby said, it is something that the people can understand. "The only time to work for peace is when there is no war. Now is the time to *do* something." He found that the people responded, not only in England, but all over the world. Albert Hall was recently crowded with 9,000 people. Peace letters are in circulation in Germany, Belgium (60,000 names already) and Finland. A letter was recently sent from Palestine with

names in Hebrew, Arabic and English. A Letter has been started in France. He regretted to say that the Church of England was not friendly—his own church. When clergymen came to the meetings, they had a "way of queering the pitch by sounding the wrong note."

As to war, he said it is not due to the "errancy of heart, but the silliness of mind." And, he vividly described how the "Belgium baby had a great deal to do in bringing the United States into the War. I saw the films as they were made, in England, to be used in America, cleverly calculated to change a Pacifist into a fighting Militarist!" "Lusitania medals—given to Germans for sinking the ship—were made in England! The great cheering crowd, that passed as gathering after the sinking in front of the Kaiser's Palace, was really a picture taken in 1914, on the occasion of the Kaiser's birthday. So, the next war will be brought on. And, it will be indescribably worse, everyway. Now is the time to fight war, in days of peace, before the people become insane. All efforts should be pushed—arbitration, leagues, outlawry, limitation of armaments—its all to the good, but there should be a personal stand taken against war, by everyone who is for peace. The press is a terrible obstacle. It is a matter of congratulation that often it has such little influence. The majority of the people often vote opposite to the suggestions of the press. I am going on with the Peace-Letter movement," said Mr. Ponsonby, as he closed in great earnestness.

After Mr. Ponsonby spoke Mr. Levinson, "father of the outlawry of war idea." He too felt that this generation should get rid of war and was glad that it was a subject that would not down. The tragedy of war will however continue as long as war is regarded as lawful. It must be outlawed. Mr. Levinson is looking for an international convention, during the next five or ten years, that will be equipped with an international radio, when the nations will be asked to sign the outlawry pledge. One supreme obstacle at present is the fact that war is the law of the world. It must be made the out-law of the world.

In the discussion there seemed at first to be a conflict, but it was only seeming. Mr. Levinson is seeking to get large human groups to declare war to be a criminal, while Mr. Ponsonby is seeking to get individuals to make solemn declaration that as for them, War shall ever be and is a criminal. Mr. Ponsonby is out to get individuals to take the total-abstinence pledge, never to take the accursed stuff—and, in all fairness, so to inform the government. Such individuals, he feels, will have *done* something that counts immediately, and they will be fitted to work with more power in all peace-efforts. Both of them seek to put war outside the pale of respectability and sanity. Both insist that this job of outlawing, individually and collectively, is a job for *this generation.*. If not *now,* the future is very dark.

While in Cincinnati, last month, I witnessed an interesting sight at the Walnut Congregational Church. About 75 Universalists attended the service, as "guests." It indicated what was perhaps the first step in the union of the two churches—in Cincinnati and possibly in other localities. The Universalists marched in, singing, "Onward, Christian soldiers." The pastor gave them an address of welcome, to which Mr. Nash, of Golden Rule fame, responded for the Universalists. The theme of sectarianism was generally aired and it seemed to be agreed that the "fathers" made a mistake, some 100 years ago, when they quarreled over doctrine and went apart, not to pray, but to antagonize. Peace seems to be inevitable after a fight—why then have the fight? And why build monuments to fighters, the scourge of the race, when it is so pleasant for brethren to dwell together in peace? While in Oak Park I saw that a new shrine had been put in the park, dedicated to the trinity of force, a soldier, a marine, an aviator. It is illuminated by night with electricity — like the manger of Bethlehem. Why worship the powers that spread disease, famine and deviltry? All these unions are beautiful but there never should have been a divorce. The Christian church should never have split into Greek and Roman, into the many varieties of Protestantism. These peace-unions are doubtless proof that man will not be satisfied with antagonisms. When I see a little company of the "Blues and Grays"—a mere fragment of the stalwart youth who marched away from home—I am impressed with the idea, that the beautiful fraternity would have been really divine had it been manifested before they killed each other. Why wait until we get to heaven before enjoying a speaking acquaintance with our neighbors? But success to the Congregationalists and the Universalists, in their love-making!

And here's a good word about the Methodists. The Education Association of the Methodist Church, South, has just gone on record, almost unanimously, as opposed to all legislation that interferes "with the proper teaching of science in American schools and colleges." Anti-evolution laws are being repudiated in many parts of the land. This is in accord with an opinion I have before expressed to my readers, that given time, the American people come to sane conclusions and act wisely.

SYDNEY STRONG.

To a Poet Friend

With each new poem I read you seem to me
Lovelier than before.
With each I deeper in your being see,
As through an opening door
Into an unsuspected garden, where
The daintiest flowers breathe forth an incense rare.

DOMBEY SHEPHERD.

For UNITY.

VISION

A Sister of Charity knelt in my pew,
And her garments were somberest black,
But somewhere behind her a stained window threw—
A splendor of crimson, gold, purple and blue—
Like a bright mantle over her back,
While I marveled how surely God knew.

EDITH CAROLYN NEWLIN.

For UNITY.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1927)

PART II—CHAPTER XXV

In India

En route for Bombay the train stopped at Allahabad for forty-five minutes. I decided to utilize the interval in a drive through the town. I also had to purchase some medicine at a chemist's shop. The chemist was half-asleep and took an unconscionable time in dispensing the medicine, with the result that when I reached the station the train had just started. The Station Master had kindly detained the train one minute for my sake, but when he did not see me coming he carefully ordered my luggage to be taken out of the train.

I took a room at Kellner's and decided to start work then and there. I had heard a good deal about the *Pioneer* published from Allahabad and I had understood it to be an opponent of Indian aspirations. I have an impression that Mr. Chesney, Jr., was the editor at that time. I wanted to secure the help of every party, so I wrote a note to Mr. Chesney telling him how I had missed the train and asking for an appointment which would enable me to leave the next day. He immediately offered me one, for which I was very happy, especially when I found that he gave me a patient hearing. He promised to notice in his paper anything that I might write, but added that he could not promise to endorse all the Indian demands, inasmuch as he was bound to understand and give due weight to the view-point of the Colonials as well.

"It is enough," I said, "that you should study the question and discuss it in your paper. I ask and desire nothing but the bare justice that is due to us."

The rest of the day was spent in having a look round and admiring the magnificent confluence of the three rivers—the Triveni—and planning the work before me.

This unexpected interview with the Editor of the *Pioneer* laid the foundation of the series of incidents which ultimately led to my being lynched in Natal.

I went straight to Rajkot without halting at Bombay and began to make preparations for writing a pamphlet on the situation in South Africa. The writing and publication of the pamphlet took about a month. It had a green cover and hence came to be known afterwards as the Green Pamphlet. In it I drew a purposely subdued picture of the condition of Indians in South Africa. The language I used was more moderate than that of the two pamphlets which I have referred to before, as I knew that things heard of from a distance appear bigger than they are.

Ten thousand copies were printed and they were sent to all the papers and leaders of every party in India. The *Pioneer* was the first to notice it editorially. A summary of the article was cabled by Reuter to England, and a summary of that summary was cabled to Natal by Reuter's London office. This cable was not longer than three lines in print. It was a miniature, but exaggerated, edition of the picture I had drawn of the treatment accorded to the Indians in Natal, and it was not in my words. We shall see later on the effect this had in Natal. In the meanwhile every paper of note commented at length on the question.

To get these pamphlets ready for posting was no small matter and an expensive one too, if I should employ paid help for preparing wrappers, etc. But I hit upon a much simpler plan. I gathered together all the children in my locality and asked them to volunteer two or three hours' labor of a morning when they had no school. This they willingly agreed to do. I promised to bless them and to give them, as a reward, used postage stamps which I had collected. They got through the work in no time. That was my first experiment having little children as volunteers. Two of those little friends are my co-workers today.

Plague broke out in Bombay about this time and there was panic all around. There was fear of an outbreak in Rajkot. As I felt that I could be of some help in the sanitation department I offered my services to the State. They were accepted, and I was put on the Committee which was appointed to look into the question. I laid especial emphasis on the cleanliness of latrines and the Committee decided to inspect them in every street. The poor people had no objection to their latrines being inspected, and, what is more, they carried out the improvements suggested to them. But when we went to inspect the houses of the upper ten, some of them even refused us admission, not to talk of agreeing to our improvements. It was our common experience that the latrines of the rich were more unclean. They were dark and stinking and reeking with filth and worms, in a word, veritable hells. The improvements we had suggested were quite simple, *e. g.*, to have buckets for excrement instead of allowing it to drop on the ground; to see that urine also was collected in buckets, instead of allowing it to soak into the ground, and to demolish the partitions between the outer walls and the latrines, so as to give the latrines more light and air and to enable the scavenger to clean them properly. The upper classes raised numerous objections to this last improvement and in most cases it was not carried out.

The Committee had to inspect the "untouchables'" quarters also. Only one member of the Committee was ready to accompany me there. To the rest it was something preposterous to visit those quarters, still more so to inspect their latrines. But for me those quarters were an agreeable surprise. That was the first visit in my life to such a locality. The men and women there were surprised to see us. I asked them to let us inspect their latrines.

"Latrines for us!" they exclaimed in astonishment. "We go and perform our functions out in the open. Latrines are for you big people."

"Well, then, you won't mind if we inspect your houses?" I asked.

"You are perfectly welcome, sir. You may see every nook and corner of our houses. Ours are no houses, they are holes."

I went in and was delighted to see that the in-

sides were as clean as the outsides. The entrances were well swept, the floors were beautifully smeared with cowdung, and the few pots and pans were clean and shining. There was no fear of an outbreak in those quarters.

In the upper class quarters we came across a latrine which I cannot help describing in some detail. Every room had its gutter which was used both for water and urine, which meant that the whole house would stink. But one of the houses had a storeyed bedroom with a gutter which was being used both as a urinal and a latrine. The gutter had a pipe descending to the ground floor. It was not possible to stand the foul smell in this room. How the occupants could sleep there I leave the readers to imagine.

The Committee also visited the *Haveli* (the chief Vaishnava temple). The priest in charge of the *Haveli* was very friendly with my family. So he agreed to let us inspect everything and suggest whatever improvements we liked. There was a part of the *Haveli* premises that he himself had never seen. It was the place where refuse and leaves, used as dinner-plates, used to be thrown over the wall. It was the haunt of crows and kites. The latrines were of course dirty. I was not long enough in Rajkot to see how many of our suggestions the priest carried out.

I was pained to see so much uncleanliness about a place of worship. One would expect a careful observance of the rules of sanitation and hygiene in a place which is regarded as holy. The sage authors of the Smritis, as I knew even then, have laid the greatest emphasis on cleanliness both inward and outward.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai*)

The Drive Against Liberalism in America*

Is America drifting towards liberalism or towards reaction? Are American people progressing rapidly or are we becoming stagnant? These are questions which confront every person who is interested in the great and fundamental problems of our civilization. There can be no question about the fact that America is going to be a potent force in the world in the years that lie immediately ahead. For good or ill, our wealth and our position have thrust us into the mid-stream of world civilization. The question which concerns many of us is not whether America is a world power but what kind of a world power is she going to be? Before we can answer the latter question we must find an answer to the former. If, in America, the forces of freedom, tolerance, and goodwill are increasing, this country can not but be an influence for good. On the other hand, if the forces of intolerance, illiberalism, and ill-will become rampant, this country can be nothing but an influence for danger to civilization. The fortunes of liberalism here are therefore inextricably bound to fortunes of civilization itself.

In order to make a brief survey of the status of liberalism at the present time, it is necessary for us to remember that during the war a tremendous impetus was given to certain democratic and progressive ideas. The definition of the war aims as being "a war for democracy," "a war to end war," to "banish militarism from the earth," and to "organize the world" let loose certain tremendously powerful forces.

While it is true that we of today have become somewhat cynical about the genuineness of these declarations and high sounding ideals, we must not forget for a moment that at the time in which they were given, they encouraged liberals everywhere to make their utmost efforts for freedom, brotherhood, and peace. There was a consequent wave of hope for liberalism which swept through many countries and became exceedingly powerful. For instance, in Germany and Czechoslovakia great strides were made toward breaking down the old autocracy, militarism, and reaction. There can be no doubt that freedom loving people won a decisive victory in many parts of the earth. Constitutions were revised, governments were recreated, labor groups gained new rights and power, while special intrenched privileges were curbed. In some cases popular education leaped forward in a decade, more rapidly than during a century before. An atmosphere of expectancy was created in which forward looking persons had new faith in the ideals of progress.

In some countries, however, these liberal forces awakened fear on the part of conservative and reactionary persons so that they, too, redoubled their efforts and a new drive was made toward repressing progress and maintaining the status quo as it was before the war. In such countries, for instance, as Austria and Hungary, there can be hardly any doubt that liberalism was thoroughly crushed while special privileged military power or some form of dictatorship won a decisive victory.

The question of importance for us is what happened in the United States. The answer is neither simple nor categorical but exceedingly complex and difficult to define. Probably the truest statement that can be made would be to say that victories were won by both sides in the struggle. Hopes for a better social order were unquestionably raised here and many new organizations were formed, looking forward to an application of greater freedom and tolerance in our national life. On the other hand, after making all the allowances possible for the victories of liberalism, it is hard for one in my position to see that these triumphs have been either numerous or wide spread.

On the other side, we know that hysteria against liberalism was awakened nearly everywhere in the country and that there have followed in quick succession, drives against pacifism, internationalism, foreigners, labor and other progressive philosophies of life. One of the most noted judges of New England has said that not since the witch scare was there a worse hysteria in the United States. Radicals were hunted and terrorized and sometimes shot. Foreigners were submitted to an

*An address delivered at the Boston Community Church.

almost nation-wide drive by such organizations as the Ku Klux Klan, until thousands became driven, frightened, and desperate. Legislation was passed by some states making it a crime to even belong to certain labor organizations. Civil liberties were abrogated, large numbers of persons were thrust into prisons for causes which seemed to liberals utterly preposterous. There was a delirium of deportation. Even the department of justice of the United States government engaged in practices which according to the judgments of some of America's most distinguished jurists were unconstitutional. Militarism gained sweeping victories by increasing our national armaments and by what is more significant, introducing compulsory drill into a large number of our schools and colleges.

With the utmost desire to retain a judicial view of the situation, and to be unbiased by any personal prejudice, it is hard to look out upon the United States at the present time and not feel that reaction has gained the upper hand and that our country is in the grip of forces making for intolerance, militarism, and stagnation.

It is my purpose to show briefly yet concretely some of the drives against liberalism which are now being made, with a special emphasis on what is going on in the city of Boston and its environment.

I shall use the word liberalism in its original sense, meaning a free and open mind. True liberalism is the opposite from dogmatism; it is a life—open, free, progressive.

While liberalism cannot be defined in inelastic terms, most liberals, I think, would agree upon one or two general outlines of a philosophy.

First, they would probably declare that change is the law of life, whether in the realm of biology, ethics, politics or religion.

No one can read history intelligently without realizing that the one factor that can be predicted with assurance is the element of constant metamorphosis of all forms and institutions. Biologically, the earth is the scene of the frequent transformations of types, species, and varieties of animal life. Some pass from existence and leave only fragments of fossils to tell their tale. Others are constantly coming on the scene to take their place. In ethics what was once considered to be right and proper is today condemned as immoral, and not to be tolerated in a civilized society. Governments come and go, and illustrate the impermanence of institutions. We who have seen many new nations formed, and many old ones destroyed, must surely realize this platitude. Religions, also, are subject to the mutations of time; for no church, no matter how earnestly it may endeavor to keep the form and spirit of the past can successfully exempt itself from some of the inevitable changes brought about by new situations in society.

Liberals might agree in the second place, that since this change is inevitable and is the law of life, the only intelligent and ethical attitude to take to it is that of scientific examination. It is our duty to understand proposed change; and then we must weigh the worth and demerits of the various programs, knowing that some of them will in all probability be adopted.

Again, those who have the liberal outlook upon life might say that one of the most dangerous things that men may do is to prevent new life from building its new forms. When the creative urge is dammed by impassable barriers, it almost always breaks forth in violence. Those who wish to see society develop in an orderly way, are the ones who will constantly seek new and better forms in ethics, government and religion. Those who were largely responsible for the extreme violence aand suffering in the French and Russian revolutions were the reactionary forces who prevented orderly and peaceful changes in the years preceding these outbreaks.

Finally, most liberals would agree that today perhaps more than at any other time in history, old forms of social life are breaking down because they are proving themselves inadequate. A new spirit is abroad seeking to build up new forms which will more effectively express the fundamental social relations of our new age. Time has made ancient good uncouth. The new world cannot longer use militarism, sectarianism or economic exploitation as means toward progress. The new conditions demand that we reconsider the basic institutions of our social order, that we recognize some of their weaknesses and failures, and that we set both our minds and our hearts to the great task of building peace, co-operation and justice.

The liberal does not dogmatically say what these new forms must be. As an individual he has his convictions and is willing to stand for them, whether they be popular or unpopular, but he does not try to force these convictions upon others, or to prevent others from having their own beliefs.

But there is one fundamental right which the liberal insists upon both for himself and for others, and that is the right to have the various proposals for the new world brought out into the open, and discussed in an atmosphere of fairness and sanity. In no other way can progress be brought about in an orderly manner.

I plead today for this fundamental right of all men everywhere to know all sides of all questions, to have access to truth from whatever source it may come. I plead for tolerance—for an attempt to understand the new spirit that is abroad in the world.

Taking up now in detail some of the drives against liberalism, I shall refer, first, to the drive against certain liberal attempts to end war as a method of settling international disputes and to establish peace securely among all nations. As soon as a liberal leaves a few of the large centers of population and goes into outlying districts in small towns and rural sections, he realizes how completely conservatism holds sway and how eager the reactionary forces are to drive liberalism out of the community or to discredit its work. The situation in Concord, Massachusetts, is probably familiar and I believe is typical of conditions which exist in large numbers of American communities. Members and friends of the Fellowship of Youth for Peace met last summer in Concord to discuss, with each other and with liberal leaders from various parts of the country, ways and means of securing a better ordering of human relations in the world. As a liberal, I should think that if there is any one promising and

beneficent event that could possibly happen, this is one of the happiest and most hopeful. Here is a group of young people drawn from all walks of life, sensitive to the chaos, hatred, and suffering which follows in the wake of war, who have no dogmatic cure-all for the situation, but who believe that it is their highest duty to counsel together with open mind in the spirit of reconciliation and love of their fellowmen.

Were such young people hailed with delight and open arms in a community like Concord where the tradition of liberalism and the spirit of Emerson and Thoreau are supposed to dwell? On the contrary, they were hailed with rotten eggs, sticks, stones, stink bombs, rowdyism, and insults. The landlady of the hotel, where many of these young people met, had finally to call on the state police in order to protect her property. The homes of other citizens known to be sympathetic with this fellowship were bombarded with potatoes and at least one minister was struck with missles. One of the selectmen, who gave permission to use the town hall for a lecture, had two state policemen at his home to guard himself and his property.

On a night when a lecture on Jefferson and Madison was scheduled, the lights in one-half the town went out. Providentially, in this case it was the wrong half of the town that was left in darkness. Six policemen were called upon to protect the audience which assembled to hear a calm and judicial discourse on so disturbing a topic as the lives of Jefferson and Madison, one hundred per cent American patriots who have been dead about one hundred years. So determined was the drive against the liberal attitude of mind in this community, that on the night when I spoke, rowdies gathered outside the hall hooting and howling, endeavoring to break up the meeting, When invited inside and given the privilege of the floor, a member of the American Legion accused the group of being financed from Moscow, and as representing un-American and subversive ideas. When challenged to give any proof whatsoever as to his statement, he could give none but fell back upon the evasive answer that other people had told him so. Attempts were made to trace the source of these rumors, but in every case it was impossible to locate them. It was said by some that detectives had proof for these charges, but such detectives were never named; they were never found, and no substantiation of the charges have been established at any time.

The books of this organization have always been open to public examination and the officers and advisory council are men and women standing high in American life and are absolutely above suspicion by any reasonable person as to any connection whatsoever with Moscow. Further charges were made against this group, that they were communistic and that they believed in free love.

These are among the most effective ways of discrediting a movement today, and they were therefore used not once but many times, with absolutely no basis of truth in either statement. After this conference was over, instead of having a protest by the citizens of the community against such rowdyism, members of the legion helped stage a large meeting, well attended by Concord citizens, to further discredit the movement.

You may say that this is an exceptional case and that it refers only to one small locality. I answer that while it may have been the most dramatic drive against liberalism in America in the field of international peace, there are many other sections of the country where conditions are almost if not quite as bad. Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead has recently returned from a trip in the interests of peace and, as most of us know, was debarred from speaking and thus from reaching large numbers of persons with her wholly sane, liberal and judicious philosophy of international relations. It may astonish you to know that a letter went out from the office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, giving advice and definite instructions as to Mrs. Mead.

Let me quote from a letter of instruction and so-called information sent from the national headquarters of the Military Order of the World War, 52 Vanderbilt avenue, New York City:

"Executive Officer, Adjutant-General, Capt. George L. Darte, National Headquarters." "You ask advice. My suggestion would be to ask Mrs. Gregory to do everything consistent in her power to prevent Mrs. Mead the courtesy of the platform of the Woman's Club in Salisbury or any other city in her state. This might be accomplished, in my humble opinion, by placing before Clubs' Committees on Program, or the body politic, if necessary, information that shows clearly just what Mrs. Mead's organized associations are, what they stand for, and what is assumed would naturally come from her as a speaker."

Notice that advice is given to refuse a courteous hearing to Mrs. Mead, because she belonged to certain organizations such as the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom, and also because she is *assumed* to say certain things. In other words, everything should be done to prevent a lecture, not because of what the lecturer is, or because of what she says, but purely on the basis of assumption. This letter further proceeds to give supposed information about the Woman's International League and other organizations so as to drive any support which Mrs. Mead might have among liberal and open-minded persons.

Attached to this letter signed in mimeograph by Mr. Darte are two pages giving further information and making the following statement: "The latest history written and revised by Mrs. Emily Green Balch for the W. I. L., shows clearly that the League is working for 'A New International Order'—none other than the slogan of the revolutionaries. Its purposes outlined in some of its literature almost paralleling the 'Third International' are as follows:" and here follows a list of objects proposed which include "Abolition of private property, (pure Communism)."

This implication or charge is untrue, and it is not supported by one word of evidence in the document.

The only possible reason for such a statement that either I or members of the Woman's International League, whom I have consulted can find, is contained in a resolution passed at a Congress in Vienna in 1921, which is as follows:

Since the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom aims at the peaceful solution of conflicts between social classes as between nations, it is the duty of its national sections and of its individual members to initiate and support laws looking to the gradual abolition of *property privileges* (for instance by means of taxation, death duties, and land

reform laws) and to the development of economic and individual freedom, and to work to awaken and strengthen among members of the possessing classes the earnest will to transform the economic system in the direction of social justice.

It will be noted that the expression "property privileges" does not refer to the private possession of property, and the resolution does not propose any communistic measure whatsoever as is clearly evident by the context. All that it urges is that the sections do what has been done for centuries; namely, reduce the privileges such as voting, which have been the sole possession of the propertied classes. And it should be borne in mind that this resolution was passed in Austria shortly after the war by people representing many countries in which almost medieval conditions existed — conditions which we in the United States consider as unjust and undemocratic.

I submit to you that this is another indication of the net-work of untruth, and insidious propaganda which is being built up throughout the country and which is of the gravest consequence because it means that if these forces which are driving against liberalism succeed, the future generation will have absolutely no opportunity to know anything about the progressive proposals which can be made toward a solution of the peace problem. I submit to you that when a person or an organization cannot actively work for "a new international order" without being definitely and absolutely wrongly linked with the "Third International" and with the abolition of private property, we have come to a sorry pass indeed. Do these military gentlemen, who issue such mis-information, boast of the old international order which brought about the catastrophe of 1914? Is our present world of international hatred and of suspicion, such an altogether lovely thing that we cannot even speak on public platforms for a new ordering of human relationships without being publicly and privately maligned?

Surely if there is any one thing the world is crying out for at the present moment, it is a new international order. And just as surely, one of the most potent forces holding back this new world is the drive of illiberalism, fear, and false propaganda.

Mr. John Nevin Sayre has recently returned from a trip through the west, where he found frequent interference with the right to discuss new ways of establishing peace. Many teachers and students have found similar difficulties within educational institutions.

What are the conditions in the City of Boston which has been the historic home of liberalism? We boast that here have lived and labored many of America's greatest champions of progressive ideas. Here freedom loving, forward looking people have found a haven of welcome and a sympathetic atmosphere in which they could make their contribution to building a better world.

While liberalism is not dead, by any means, and there are many signs of its healthy activity, there is no question whatsoever that desperate endeavor is being made to fight it, both by officials and by private organizations.

It is a matter of record that two mayors of the city in recent years have endeavored to prevent free speech which is guaranteed to the American people by the Constitution of the United States. They have endeavored to use autocratic authority in preventing a person or persons whose doctrines they did not like, from speaking in public. No matter whether we like or thoroughly condemn radicals or conservatives, it is the duty, to say nothing of the privilege of the constituted authorities of our various governments to guard this most fundamental of all our liberties—the freedom of speech, press and assembly. When this historic right of the people to hear new ideas and to choose between both sides of a debatable question is abrogated by our duly constituted authorities, it is the beginning of the end for liberalism and for democracy. We must be vigilant in our watch lest a beginning shall be made toward abrogating this first essential of all true political and social progress.

One of the agencies of supreme importance which sometimes lends itself to misstatement of fact, and which consequently misinforms the public, is a certain section of the press. If any institution should recognize the need for scrupulous adherence to truth, it is the press, as it is for most people the only avenue of information regarding most of the occurrences in the world beyond our personal relationships. Our judgments must be based on facts, and most people assume that most statements in the press are to be regarded as dependable. The newspaper should be ethically sensitive, holding its staff members up to the highest ideals of honor and truth, and should be especially careful not to allow personal bias, or the heat of political campaigns to lead to statements of a malicious character, distorting truth, giving a false impression, and hurting both individuals and organizations.

It is with especial regret that I mention one particular instance of misstatement of fact by the Boston Evening Transcript under date of October 30, 1926. It was written on the eve of the election, when the paper was making especial efforts to return Senator Butler to the Senate and to defeat Mr. Walsh, Democratic candidate for that body. After making many statements about the Democratic Party and its candidate which seem to me both unjustified and untrue one article contains these words:

"He (Mr. Walsh) met with these radicals last May at 6 Byron Street, Boston, the Communist headquarters of Mass." In order to be exact, I find that the Standard Dictionary defines headquarters as being "Any central place where persons in authority are stationed, any chief or main distributing-center from which orders or information may be issued."

It happens that I have been a trustee of the Byron Street Trust which operates this building, and I have been closely associated with its activities since its beginning. It is the headquarters of the Community Church in Boston, and also rents offices to the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Fellowship of Youth for Peace, the League for Democratic Control and to private individuals.

I say with all possible emphasis that this statement of the *Transcript* calling 6 Bryon Street "the Communist headquarters of Massachusetts" is absolutely untrue. No persons of authority in the Communist Party have ever been stationed there. No Communist organization has ever rented a room there, and there has never been a meeting under Communist auspices in the place, and it has never been the distributing center of the Communist Party. It seems pitiful that a property cannot be devoted to freedom of speech, peace, industrial democracy, and building the Kingdom of God on earth without having such untrue statements made about it. Two members of the *Transcript* staff have been interviewed and re-

quested to make a retraction of this statement, and they have refused. So this untruth stands, giving a serious misunderstanding reflecting upon the Community Church and upon the other organizations.

A much more serious menace to the cause of liberalism exists in the activities of an organization known as the "Industrial Defense Association," which is organized according to its statement of purpose "to inculcate principles of Americanism in Industrial, Religious, Fraternal and Educational circles." Its publication "What's What," has carried on a campaign of so-called information which contains many absolutely untrue statements, made either directly, or indirectly by quotation. It tells untruths about both organizations and individuals for which no proof is given. Its charges are frequently made in a cunning and confused way so that readers are led to infer wrong conclusions. In a sheet listing over 250 societies and organizations, all are put under the one heading "Communists, Socialists, Pacifists, I. W. W. and Doubtful Societies and Organizations operating in the United States." Included in this are such organizations on the one side as the American Association for Labor Legislation, which is neither Communist, Socialist, Pacifist, I. W. W. or Doubtful, and the American Communist Labor Party which is not Pacifist or Doubtful, and the Foreign Policy Association which has absolutely no tinge of Communism about it. The League for the Abolition of Capital Punishment, the League of Neighbors, the Mothers League of Jewish Women, and both the Harvard and Radcliffe Liberal Clubs are included in this general category, besides many others too numerous to mention.

This method of making a blanket charge of such diverse crimes as pacifism and communism, and then listing organizations which are as far apart as the poles in intent and method is an old and thoroughly discredited way of casting wholesale suspicion on peoples and organizations. Of course it is absolutely unscientific, untrustworthy, and misleading, and no person who is accustomed to the rudiments of social investigation would give a particle of credence to such a list. But the sad fact is that large numbers of people have no training in the technique of investigation and report, and consequently are not adequately on guard against such misrepresentation.

Referring to the directorate of what are called "high sounding organizations" this publication says:

> However ignorant of the truth their dupes may be, the shameful history of these societies is well known to investigators. Over them all is the *snake slime of Socialism.*

I wish it to be clearly understood that I am not upholding socialism, communism, or any other specific method of solving the problems of life; but I do protest against such an insinuation that socialism is a snake slime covering the people who embrace it with shame. This is an effective but a wholly unjustifiable and illiberal method of discrediting organizations and persons.

Again, a list of organizations is presented as being seditious—American Association for Labor Legislation; Amos Council Appeal Committee; Inter-Collegiate Liberal League and League of Neighbors are included in this list. Not one concrete act of any of these organizations is cited as seditious. The truth is they are not so as any one can tell by reading their records.

Among other attacks which are made in this publication are two of special interest to liberals throughout the country. First, that against Jane Addams, who is recognized internationally as one of the finest products of modern civilization. She is charged with belonging to or having connections with twenty-eight organizations, nineteen of which are "clearly subversive in character." Among such organizations are the American Association for Labor Legislation. American League to Limit Armaments, LaFollette-Wheeler Campaign Committee, Peoples Legislative Service, etc. The statement is further made that

> In view of Miss Addams' activities in recent years, question has been raised as to whether Hull House has ever been anything than a recruiting station for Socialists.

Any person who is anxious to find out whether Hull House has ever been anything but a recruiting station for Socialism could easily obtain conclusive data. This charge which has already affected the support of Miss Addams' work is entirely unwarranted, is damaging to Miss Addams' character and integrity of purpose and to the sincerity of the splendid people who have devoted themselves to the noble work of this settlement.

Another attack is made upon Mr. John Haynes Holmes. It charges him with being affiliated with seditious organizations, the ultimate purpose of which has been the wrecking of our governmental, social and religious institutions. He is directly charged with championing the I. W. W. and thus being a contributing cause to acts of violence. It is stated that he has been prominent in the Inter-Collegiate Liberal League and other organizations, whose purpose it is to "instill the poison of Communism into our colleges." A direct misstatement of fact is made in the following quotation:

> John Haynes Holmes changed the name of his so-called Church from Church of Messiah to Community Church as an outward mark of his change of heart from Christianity to Communism.

If the author of this untruth had carefully investigated the history of the Community Church Movement, he would have discovered that it was entirely American in its origin; that articles about the movement had been written by purely American writers, and that Mr. Holmes took up the idea of the Community Church, not at all because of a change of heart from Christianity to Communism but, because of a change of conviction from sectarianism to a more universal form of church organization.

I hold in my hand a legally executed affidavit from Mr. Holmes, which states that six charges which are made in this publication are: "false, and therefore libelous." It is therefore clear to any open minded person that the statements which are being made in this and similar publications are doing the gravest possible injustice to individuals, and are contributing in a most serious way to misunderstanding which may lead to hatred and suspicion.

Mr. Holmes and other men are charged with carrying on an insidious, anti-religious campaign in such reviews as UNITY and the *World Tomorrow.* It so happens that I am a contributing editor of UNITY—that I have taken the magazine for years—that I have read it carefully, and that there is absolutely no foundation for this unwarranted statement that there is an anti-religious campaign being carried on in its columns. As to the *World Tomorrow,* it is a magazine devoted to applying the religion of Jesus to all phases of the social order, and the charge which is made against it is absolutely misleading, damaging to the magazine and to the contributors who write for it.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP

Congress Hotel
Chicago

Someone has said that this is not the day of the independence but of the inter-dependence of nations. This idea and the consideration of methods by which a consciousness of world citizenship may be developed on the part of the citizen of today and of the future will be the theme of this Conference.

The Conference will be held March 12 in the Congress Hotel under the auspices of the Chicago League of Women Voters' Forum and the Association for Peace Education. A number of the teachers' organizations of the city and the Education Departments of both the Chicago Woman's Club and the Chicago Woman's Aid are cooperating.

The following speakers have been secured: Prof. Harold Rugg of the Lincoln School in New York will speak on "The Construction of the Curriculum and the Development of International Understanding;" Prof. J. Paul Goode of the University of Chicago will speak on "Geography and World Citizenship;" and Prof. Harry A. Overstreet of the College of the City of New York will speak on "Building up the International Mind." A number of teachers from the schools of Chicago and vicinity will take part in the discussion.

It is urged that all those who desire to arouse public opinion in regard to the necessity of international cooperation and international understanding do all they can to spread the news of this Conference and urge its importance. Wide publicity for it should be secured and all interested in the aims of the Conference should make it a point not only to be present themselves, but to urge upon as many others as possible the importance of attending the Conference.

Mark March 12 on your calendar.

IN SUPPORT OF SENATOR BORAH

The Massachusetts Committee on Mexican Relations Has Adopted the Following Resolution

The Massachusetts Citizens' Committee on Mexican Relations expresses its profound gratitude to Hon. William E. Borah, chairman of the foreign relations committee of the Senate, for the resolution which he has submitted, providing for a visit by members of the committee to Mexico and Central America, to find out the facts bearing on the present critical situation, and to sit during the recess of Congress at such times as it deems advisable.

The grave situation in Mexico and Nicaragua is not improving, and it is at this moment aggravated by the landing of additional military forces in Nicaragua to re-enforce the large

Just Published

A new book that will bring cheer and serenity into your life

PEACE OF MIND

BY

RABBI MORRIS LICHTENSTEIN

Leader and Founder of the Jewish Science Movement, Author of the Text-book of Jewish Science "Jewish Science and Health."

THIS volume meets an urgent need in the life of our restless generation. It shows how to work and live serenely; how to face and solve the problems of life courageously and effectively; above all, how to advance and prosper without the sacrifice of health and peace of mind.

Cloth, 360 Pages, $2.50 Postpaid

For your own advantage, do not delay. Order now from

JEWISH SCIENCE PUBLISHING CO.
100 West 72d St., New York City.

One of the activities and organizations against which these people are most bitter is the Civil Liberties Union, and they have gone to extraordinary lengths to misrepresent it, and to cast doubts upon the persons who are connected with it. The rights of freedom of speech, press and assemblage are guaranteed by our constitution. There may be many people who dislike these provisions in our national Bill of Rights, but let me remind them that if the terms unamerican and subversive are to be used, it is more appropriate to apply them to the people who try to prevent the application of these laws, than to the people who are upholding them.

If the activities of the American Civil Liberties Union are illegal and are subversive of government, Federal agents should have discovered the fact before now, and the Federal courts have ample power to determine that fact of guilt, and they would have the right to arrest, convict, and imprison persons who are wrecking our political and social institutions. But since no Federal action (so far as I know) has been brought and since most of the members of the Civil Liberties Union go about their work in good health without such interference and manage to keep out of jail, it is safe to assume that the Committee and its acts are within constitutional rights.

A letter is quoted from Mr. Ralston Welsh of Philadelphia saying, If the founders of the Civil Liberties Union had been frank, they would have called it the "Unamerican Criminal License Union." It has now thrown off the mask, and no one connected with it, who uses ordinary discretion and intelligence, can help knowing that it is a communistic organization whose subversive methods are aimed at the undermining of our Government. Its members are engaged in all sorts of propaganda, from hypocritical humanitarian and peace propaganda., etc.

When it comes to calling the work of Jane Addams, Professor Harry Ward, John Haynes Holmes, and Elizabeth Glendower Evans hypocritical, I admit that my blood boils, and I feel that the time has come when such kind of propaganda should be met with a new determination on the part of Liberals everywhere in this country to stand and work for the truth, freedom, and progress as never before.

I submit to the fair and honest judgment of Americans everywhere that a man who could write that statement, and others who would circulate such a quotation are so poorly equipped with understanding of the liberal cause and way of life, that they are incapable of interpreting it to others.

Officials of the Industrial Defense Association are appealing for 1,000 members at $10 apiece to carry on a part of their work.

The *Nation*, in a recent issue, states that a group of persons in Chicago are planning to form a foundation for similar purposes and that they are appealing for a two million dollar fund, which shall be used to prevent certain liberal speakers from being heard. Wherever we go through the country, we find that similar activities are in full sway.

What shall the answer of liberals be? Surely, if ever, now is the time for us to stand and fight together for justice and truth.

In the words of Edwin Markham:

Come, clear the way, then clear the way!
Blind creeds and kings have had their day.
Break the dead branches from the path;
Our hope is in the aftermath—
Our hope is in heroic men,
Star-led to build the world again.
To this event the ages ran;
Make way for Brotherhood—make way for man.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

forces already there. So far from being a guard against any apparent danger, this action seems to us a new menace to law and order, which will be interpreted throughout South America as an effort to overawe and suppress the manifest majority in Nicaragua in our selfish commercial interest. It brings the possibility of collision and war more sharply upon the horizon.

The Constitution has wisely placed war in the control of Congress; and Congress and the people should be jealous of all activities of the Executive which threaten to precipitate war or the strained relations which might lead to war. We feel that the recent course of the President and the State Department toward Nicaragua and Mexico has not been such as makes for peace and friendship, and that the reasons for that course submitted to Congress and the people do not inspire confidence. There is an imperative demand for more knowledge, larger intelligence, higher aims and higher courage in dealing with the crisis, and need especially that the proper committee of Congress shall keep the situation constantly under supervision during the approaching recess. Senator Borah, who throughout has dealt with the situation with conspicuous understanding and resolution, is entitled to the new gratitude of patriotic and peace-loving citizens for this timely act of statesmanship, as Congress is about to adjourn.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY AT MASS MEETING, LYRIC THEATRE, NEW YORK CITY

1. We, citizens of the United States in mass meeting assembled in the Lyric Theatre, New York City, January 30, 1927, do hereby urge President Coolidge to maintain the honorable tradition of the United States by submitting the present dispute with Mexico over property rights to arbitration or other peaceful settlement, and do further urge him to assist stability in Mexico by maintaining recognition of its government and by continuing the embargo on arms, so that no act of ours may let loose there the horrors of civil war.

2. We, citizens of the United States in mass meeting assembled in the Lyric Theatre, New York City, January 30, 1927, holding that each nation has the inalienable right to develop its own form of government, and that no other nation is entitled to interfere therein, do urge the passage of Senate Resolution 309, which would recall from Nicaragua the American marines and warships now stationed there. If further measures are advisable for peace and order in Nicaragua we urge that they be taken in conjunction with other Latin-American powers.

3. We, citizens of the United States in mass meeting assembled in the Lyric Theatre, New York City, January 30, 1927, believing that now is the time to lay the foundation of a just and consistent foreign policy, and realizing our lack of information regarding American commitments abroad, do hereby urge the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs to report favorably Senate Resolution 319, providing for Congressional investigation of American investments and concessions in foreign countries.

4. We, citizens of the United States in mass meeting assembled in the Lyric Theatre, New York City, January 30, 1927, deplore the concentration of military forces against China, and do not believe that the best protection of American interests is thus attained. We note with approval the statement of Secretary of State Kellogg that the United States is ready to negotiate equal treaties with China, and we hereby urge the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 45, which would carry out this purpose.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE CHICAGO

Friday Morning Forum
10:30 A. M.

March 11—Frederick Starr
The Latest from Japan

March 18—*The Isles of Fear*
Dr. Starr returned from Japan in December. He attended as delegate from the University of Chicago, the Pan-Pacific Science Congress at Tokyo in October and spent a month in Korea.

March 25—Henry Neumann
Can Human Nature Be Changed?
Leader, Brooklyn Society of Ethical Culture

April 1—Harry Elmer Barnes
Responsibility for the World War

MARCH

The expectant feeling of Spring is in the air. It's high time to get ready the new season's apparel—to start the big home cleaning. Therefore we suggest the cleansing of both garments and home furnishings by our process of continuous clarification—the most efficient possible.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0381 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Do This for their sake!

GIVE your children Bowman's Milk. It furnishes quick energy to offset fatigue. It builds fine teeth and strong bones. A quart a day is none too much, so doctors say.

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.